

S/N: 10/671,932  
YOR920030164US1 (YOR.459)

### **REMARKS**

Applicants gratefully acknowledge Examiner Crawley and SPE Gart for courtesies extended during a personal interview on February 24, 2010. During that interview, Applicants' representative pointed out that the present invention clearly differs from either the Smartt reference or the Jagadish reference because neither reference was directed to moving objects and neither reference had any concept of a continual query region, let alone the concept of strictly covering the continual query region.

That is, as Applicants' representative explained, the Smartt reference is directed to the use of shingles as a mechanism to cover two-dimensional objects identified in a two-dimensional space, for purpose of using these shingles as a location for these multi-point objects. There are no continual query regions in Smartt, let alone a query region that is strictly covered by shingles as described by the present invention.

Jagadish is directed to text and, therefore, not relevant in any way to the two-dimensional continual query regions of the present invention directed to monitoring moving objects in a two-dimensional or three-dimensional space, let alone defining a strict covering of continual query regions. The Examiner indicated that she considered that Jagadish could be used to monitor relative movements of text entities in a computer memory.

SPE Gart agreed that he would consider the independent claims allowable if a more positive description of moving objects were incorporated.

Claims 1, 2, and 4-25 are all of the claims presently pending in the application. Various claims are amended for clarity, in accordance with the request of SPE Gart, although it is noted that the version of the claims previous to this amendment is believed by Applicants as clearly distinguishing from the two cited references.

It is noted that Applicant specifically states that no amendment to any claim herein should be construed as a disclaimer of any interest in or right to an equivalent of any element or feature of the amended claim.

Claims 1-16 and 25 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as allegedly anticipated by US Patent 5,963,956 to Smartt. Claims 17-20, 22, and 23 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as allegedly anticipated by US Patent 7,010,522 to Jagadish et al. Claim 21 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Jagadish, further in view of Smartt. Claim 24 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over

S/N: 10/671,932  
YOR920030164US1 (YOR.459)

Smartt.

The above amendments are understood as rendering moot these rejections.

### **FORMAL MATTERS AND CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that claims 1, 2, and 4-25, all the claims presently pending in the application, are patentably distinct over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to pass the above application to issue at the earliest possible time.

Should the Examiner find the application to be other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the local telephone number listed below to discuss any other changes deemed necessary in a telephonic or personal interview.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in fees or to credit any overpayment in fees to Assignee's Deposit Account No. 50-0510.

Respectfully Submitted,



Date: March 25, 2010

\_\_\_\_\_  
Frederick E. Cooperrider  
Reg. No. 36,769

**McGinn Intellectual Property Law Group, PLLC**  
8321 Old Courthouse Road, Suite 200  
Vienna, VA 22182-3817  
(703) 761-4100  
**Customer No. 21254**